A U M

Like a man wearing an actor's costumes of honour or dishonour, so, verily, that excellent knower of the Eternal is ever the Eternal and no other.

—CREST JEWEL OF WISDOM.

THEOSOPHY

Vol. XXVII July, 1939 No. 9

SCIENCE AND TRUTH

IN the seventeenth century, John Smith, one of the Cambridge Platonists, wrote: "The reason why, notwithstanding all our acute reasons and subtile disputes, Truth prevails no more in the world, is, we so often disjoyn *Truth* and true Goodness, which in themselves can never be disunited." This criticism, made at a time when scientific modes of thought were just beginning to be formulated, is still an accurate and succinct commentary on modern theories of knowledge.

The idea that scientific knowledge needs to be conjoined with a sense of moral obligation, — or, to use words meaning the same thing but more in keeping with the modern spirit, with a sense of "social responsibility"—is now a conception of wide-spread expression and increasing emphasis. The destruction wrought by men with the powers of nature placed in their hands by science has shown the supreme importance of this need. Thus we are faced with a problem to which scientific men, as scientists, have given little thought. How is this sense of social responsibility to be aroused?

For generations philosophers of science have held that ethical considerations are a distracting intrusion in the sphere of "pure" research. *Facts,* they have asserted, are one thing, and values (if, indeed, values exist at all) quite another. Because Plato refused to separate knowledge from the moral scheme of human life, he has been condemned as having interfered with the progress of "exact science." But although today the acuteness of our moral or social problems is increasingly evident to the scientific mind, Plato is far from being vindicated. The knowledge of science is still thought to be *knowledge,* and that it needs only to be joined with ethics. But that this would be no natural union is not perceived; we have yet to learn that truly *scientific* ethics is more than a mere emotional infusion of uninstructed "good will" to dilute the materialism of our civilization.

The real problem has to do with the nature of the "facts" with which science attempts to deal. No fact is simple and single, but stands in relation to all other facts. In a sevenfold universe, there must be *seven* major relations for every fact. Unless these are known, our understanding of the facts is partial, and is therefore deceptive if believed to be complete. Let us reduce the problem to simpler terms. If the world is regarded under *three* aspects of reality, Spiritual, Psychical, Physical, then all things and beings stand in threefold relation with all other things and beings.

Almost all the facts of science are "physical" facts—descriptions, that is, of the forms and the movements of matter. Physical science has formulated laws which give an account of the dynamic play between the objects thus described. With these laws as the basis of speculation, theories of cause and effect and of the fundamental nature of things have been deduced—theories forming the rambling structure of metaphysical materialism, *i. e.,* the doctrine that the first principles of things are exhibited in the properties and attributes of visible phenomena. The Psychical world, insofar as it is granted any real existence, is described in refinements of the terms of physics; psychic happenings are "epiphenomenal"; their self-existent reality is only seeming and has no being apart from the physical world. The Spiritual world is *terra incognita* to science.

What kind of knowledge, then, is scientific knowledge? Is it conceivable that a true ethics can be joined with science, so long as the principles of science remain a negation of the concepts of universal purpose and moral interdependence? Is it not self-evident that a true understanding of the physical world includes also the knowledge of Mind and Spirit, and the interrelation of all three?

Both the scientist and the student of spiritual philosophy see the same facts, but here ends the unity of their perceptions. The entire grammar of science—its ways of describing phenomena—is organized in terms of materialistic assumption, so that even the bare account of the *appearance* of the physical world little resembles the philosopher's description of the same phenomena. The extremes of opposition between the two views are reached when facts are discussed with reference to their *meaning.*

The science and ethics of Theosophy are not divided ways of thought; they are two aspects of the same truth: Compassion is no attribute; it is the *Law of Laws.* The *Bhagavad-Gita* and the *Voice of the Silence* are as scientific as they are ethical. The world of knowledge and the world of right action are *one,* and until this is seen and acted upon, there will be no Truth in the world of men.

ANCIENT LANDMARKS

Socrates

THE Age of the Tyrants, which produced the "Seven Wise Men," the early Ionian School and the Pythagorean School, ended about 500 B.C. Shortly afterward Greece was invaded by the Persians under Darius and Xerxes, who left Athens in ruins and the Greeks more closely united than ever before. In 460 B.C. Pericles assumed the leadership of the progressive party, gathering around him a glittering galaxy of statesmen, philosophers, dramatists and artists. Aided by the immortal Phidias, he undertook to restore the smoke-blackened Acropolis. Slowly arose the Parthenon, with the magnificent frieze by Phidias inside the colonnades. Ten centuries later the Emperor Theodosius, dictator of the Western world, turned it into a Christian Church dedicated to the Virgin Mary. In 1687, while the Turks were using it as a powder magazine, a German lieutenant fired the fatal shot which reduced this crowning glory of Grecian art to a mere skeleton.

In 469 B.C. Phaenarete, the wife of an Athenian sculptor, gave birth to her son Socrates, whose fame was immortalized by his pupils, Xenophon and Plato. Despite his poverty, Socrates participated freely in all the cultural advantages of the city, from which not even the humblest citizen was debarred. After spending several years in his father's workshop, he decided that his mission in life was not to be a sculptor of figures, but a moulder of souls. This conviction came to him after hearing that the Delphic Oracle had described him as the wisest man in Greece. Failing to understand the Oracle's statement, yet not daring to contradict it, Socrates went among his learned friends, contrasting their knowledge with his own. He soon realized that they were all as ignorant as he, the only difference being that they were unaware of their ignorance, while he, at least, knew that he knew nothing. He therefore concluded that the Oracle had chosen him as an instrument to prick the bubble of self-deception and conceit which permitted ignorance to parade itself in the borrowed garments of wisdom.

Socrates carried out his mission with no background of wealth, social position or personal charm to aid him. In appearance he was the exact opposite of the Greek ideal of beauty, his thick lips, protruding eyes, snub nose and shambling gait making him the laughing stock of Athens. Poverty was his bosom friend, frugality his boon companion. He walked through the streets of Athens barefoot,

clad in a single threadbare garment which served for summer and winter alike. Between his life at home with Xantippe and the wars of the Greeks abroad in which he participated, Socrates found little opportunity for quiet study. Despite these obstacles, he has come down in history as a model of the virtues. Xenophon wrote:

> No one ever heard or saw anything wrong in Socrates. So just was he that he never injured anyone in the least; so master of himself that he never preferred pleasure to goodness; so sensible that he never erred in his choice between what was better and what was worse. In a word, he was of men the best and wisest.

The *Phaedo*, in which Plato describes the last hours of Socrates on earth, closes with these words: "Such, Echecrates, was the end of our associate, a man, as we should say, the best and also the wisest and most righteous of his time."

Our knowledge of Socrates is almost altogether based on the dialogues of Plato. The best of modern scholars now regard the picture of the sage presented by Xenophon as drawn from Platonic sources. The only other source of any importance is the caricature of Socrates made by Aristophanes in the *Clouds*—material hardly suitable for accurate biography. John Burnet, in the first volume of his *Greek Philosophy: Thales to Plato*, observes:

> Like Shakespeare, Plato had a marvellous gift of suppressing his own personality when engaged in dramatic composition. That is why his personality is so elusive, and why that of Socrates has so often been substituted for it (p. 149).

It would be natural for an initiate—which Plato was—to "suppress his own personality," allowing the figure of his teacher to appear as the author of the sublime philosophy which Plato recorded. Plato was only following the ancient practice of prefacing all teaching with the Buddhist formula, "Thus have I heard," and observing the occult injunction: "That power which the disciple shall covet is that which shall make him appear as nothing in the eyes of men."

Mr. Burnet shows how difficult it is to separate the "real" Socrates from the Platonic account. Xenophon, he points out, is far from trustworthy, and quite inadequate. Following is the view of this authority, after a quarter of a century devoted to the study of this and similar problems:

> . . . in practice every writer fills in the outline with as much of the Platonic Socrates as happens to suit his preconceived ideas of the man. Such a procedure is hopelessly arbitrary, and can only land us in unverifiable speculations. It would be far better

> to say at once that we cannot know anything about Socrates, and that for us he must remain a mere *x*. Even so, however, the Platonic Socrates is actual enough, and he is the only Socrates we can hope to know well. If he is a fictitious character, he is nevertheless more important than most men of flesh and blood (pp. 127-8).

The outline of the life and thought of Socrates here presented is therefore of Platonic origin. This is the Socrates who has had such enormous influence on all subsequent philosophy, which was what Plato intended, and it would be fruitless to attempt to "improve" on Plato.

Socrates is frequently described as a "mystic," the meaning of this term varying with the biographer. It is well known that he was subject to ecstatic trances, that for hours he would stand still in some subjective state, his friends knowing better than to disturb him. During the military operations of the Athenians at Potidæa, when Socrates was not quite forty years old, he remained standing motionless in one place from early morning of one day until sunrise on the next, unaffected by a hard frost during the night. He had an inner "voice," or *daemon*, whose injunctions he followed. According to Plato, the daemon gave only negative admonitions, which may account for the theory of some writers that the "voice" was merely that of conscience. H. P. Blavatsky wrote that "the *Daimonion* of Socrates is the god or Divine Entity which inspired him all his life." Nevertheless, because of the *passive* nature of this relationship, Socrates is chosen by her to illustrate the danger of *untrained* mediumship. "The old Grecian philosopher," she says, "was a 'medium'; hence he had never been initiated into the Mysteries; for such was the rigorous law." (*Isis Unveiled* I, xx; II, 117.) This pure and unselfish psychic, then, was idealized by Plato, who thus showed reverence and love for the teacher of his early years by making him appear as the channel through which the ancient wisdom was revealed to the western world.

Socrates started his life-work by carefully investigating the various scientific and philosophical systems of the day, finding in Anaxagoras the nearest approach to his own concepts. As he was reaching maturity, the Sophists came into power. Their leader, Protagoras, denied the existence of the human soul, declaring that "the soul is nothing more than the sum of the different moments of thinking." Gorgias derided morality and tried to prove by metaphysical deduction that nothing really exists. Socrates, opposing these materialistic thinkers, became the leader of a new move-

ment in which the existence of real knowledge and the inherent dignity of the human soul were the leading ideas.

True wisdom, Socrates said, consists in the knowledge of the *essence* of things. This form of knowledge cannot be acquired from without, but must be sought within the soul itself. His first aim, therefore, was to train men to *think,* and by thinking to reach the source of knowledge within themselves.

Socrates taught the existence of a *real* world above the world of sense—a world subject neither to generation nor to decay. This real world he considered as the underlying Unity behind all diversity. But he also believed that, in order to know the Truth about all things, man must start by knowing *himself.* He taught that self-knowledge is based upon the conviction that man is an immortal entity, a soul which is a spark of the Universal World-Soul. This soul, he said, is entombed in a body, and evolves through the process of reincarnation. Taking his clue from Anaxagoras, he taught that the *nous* in man is able to penetrate into the region of *noumena,* the true source of wisdom.

It must not be concluded, however, that Socrates, and not Plato, was the author of the "Theory of Ideas." Strictly speaking, of course, Plato was the *author* of none of his doctrines, which are identical with the wisdom revealed by the ancient Hindu sages. The Platonic forms or archetypes were representations of the world as it existed in Universal Mind, as pointed out in *The Secret Doctrine* I, 200. Mr. Burnet's fidelity to the Platonic account of Socrates makes him suppose that the Theory of Forms or Ideas was an invention of Plato's teacher, because the doctrine is enunciated by Socrates in the dialogues. It seems probable, however, that this highly metaphysical explanation of the nature of things originated with Plato and merely was represented by him as being taught by Socrates. Aristotle, who had no reason to conceal the truth of this matter, says in his *Metaphysics* that Socrates occupied himself only with questions of moral philosophy, and that Plato introduced both the name and the conception of the "Ideas." We repeat, the Socrates here pictured, insofar as philosophical teaching is concerned, is Socrates as he appears in Plato's writings, and not Socrates the historical character.

Socrates considered the moral and intellectual worlds as inseparable. He could not conceive of true knowledge existing apart from virtue, or of virtue without knowledge. He who knows himself, Socrates said, will of necessity perform right actions. Conversely, he who is unacquainted with his own spiritual nature will, without

fail, perform wrong actions. With Socrates, as with Kant, the development of morality was the aim and end of philosophy.

Virtue, said Socrates, is based upon knowledge. He considered all knowledge to be contained in the soul, it needing only to be remembered. As Mr. Judge puts it, "Getting back the memory of other lives is really the whole of the process." How can that knowledge be recovered save by entering into the storehouse of *Manas,* where the thoughts of all lives are carefully preserved?

This idea brought Socrates into immediate conflict with the Sophists. They imparted information, while Socrates tried to stimulate thought. They demanded money for their instruction; Socrates taught without remuneration. They imposed their own views upon their pupils; Socrates tried to draw out the inner convictions of his pupils and, by the process of reasoning, to replace false ideas with true. Every day he could be seen wandering through the market places and public walks of Athens, always ready for a word with friend or stranger, always eager to turn a trivial conversation into intellectual or moral channels. Often those who talked with him once came back the following day. After a while a group of young men began to speak of themselves as his pupils. This loosely connected group was the Socratic School.

His mode of instruction, known as the Socratic method, was conversational. Socrates would approach a person and ask a question. In the answer given he found material for another question, this one being a little more profound. Boring deeper and deeper below the surface of popular ideas, like a miner he exposed not only the rocks and debris of false ideas, but also the golden nuggets of true wisdom. The false ideas, which he called notions or opinions, were then discarded; the true ideas, which he called concepts, retained. Thus sorting and eliminating, he led his pupil by gradual stages to the universal truth lying within every proposition. This fundamental truth he called the *essence.*

Although Socrates refused to enter into politics, he entertained a high opinion of statesmanship. He performed his own civic duties with unswerving fidelity, enduring even death in order not to violate the laws of his country. Believing that the well-being of the state depends upon the integrity of its leaders, he used every opportunity to enlist the able into the service of the state, to deter the incompetent from assuming office, to awaken officials to a sense of their responsibility and to give them whatever help he could in the administration of their offices. He insisted that every man who aspired to the position of statesman should prepare himself for his

calling by a thorough course of self-examination and study. He demanded an aristocracy based not upon wealth or birth but upon knowledge and virtue. Instead of the ordinary citizen-rulers, he insisted upon statesmen who were morally without reproach and who had developed the power to think for themselves. The politicians of his day believed in doing good to friends and harm to enemies. Socrates insisted upon universal brotherhood, teaching that it is wrong to injure *any* person, even a bitter enemy.

Plato gives the Socratic conception of political ideals in *Republic*. There Socrates says:

> Unless it happen either that philosophers acquire the kingly power in states, or that those who are now called kings and potentates be imbued with a sufficient measure of genuine philosophy, that is to say, *unless political power and philosophy be united in the same person* . . . there will be no deliverance . . . for cities, nor yet, I believe, for the human race.

This idea is as important today as it was 2,500 years ago. Both good and evil—whether they find their expression in city, state or nation—have their roots in human character. The progress of any nation depends entirely upon the development of the nobler qualities in the citizens themselves.

The blunt criticisms of existing conditions made by Socrates brought out a horde of enemies in both the educational and political fields. Few people are able to bear an exposure of their shortcomings with equanimity. Few statesmen are able to smile when their mental and moral weaknesses are held up for public inspection. The unswerving devotion of the sage to what he considered as his mission sometimes made him careless of the resentment he might arouse. His uncompromising analysis of the government made the Athenians suspicious of his motives. His denunciation of the gods aroused the enmity of those who followed in the old ways. His new system of education fanned the anger of the Sophists to fever heat.

When Socrates was seventy years old, he was publicly accused of atheism and of exerting a harmful influence upon the youth of the land. Although realizing the seriousness of the accusation, Socrates refused to defend himself. The *Apology,* as we have it in Plato, is rather an unequivocal affirmation of the Socratic philosophy, than a "defense." At his trial Socrates made no plea for pardon and offered no excuse for his actions. The result was what might have been expected. His proud and dignified bearing offended the popular tribunal, and those who might have been clement to a cringing and apologetic man were merely irritated by the poise and self-assurance

of Socrates. After a short deliberation, a verdict of guilty was returned.

Asked if he were willing to give up his former mode of life if he were pardoned, he refused, although he offered to pay a small fine. The judges regarded this as incorrigible obstinacy as well as contempt of court, and sentenced him to die. He was then sent to prison for thirty days. During this period he held his customary conversations daily with his friends and pupils and maintained his usual cheerfulness and unclouded brightness of disposition. His last day on earth was spent in quiet philosophical conversation. When the evening came and the cup of hemlock was presented to him, he drank it with a strength of mind so unshaken and a resignation so complete that the grief of his friends was turned into wonder and admiration.

It is very plain that the recorded charges of irreligion and of corrupting the youth of Athens were not the real reason for the condemnation of Socrates. The accusation of disrespect for the gods, or disbelieving in the mythological accounts of their activities, could not have been so seriously regarded. The comedies of the time treat these matters very lightly, and no one was ever prosecuted for religious opinions. "Socrates," writes H. P. B., "invariably refused to argue upon the mystery of universal being, yet no one would ever have thought of charging him with atheism, except those who were bent upon his destruction." (*Isis Unveiled* II, 264.) John Burnet concludes his discussion of the problem by showing how vague were the Athenians themselves as to the offense of Socrates:

> In fact, everyone speculates about the meaning of the charge, and the one fact that stands out clearly is that no one—not even the prosecutor—seems to know it. It surely follows that the charge of introducing new divinities, though stated in the indictment, was neither explained nor justified at the trial.

Mr. Burnet supposes that because the Socrates of the dialogues tried to revive the Orphic theory of the soul and the Pythagorean teachings, he had been initiated in the Orphic mysteries at an early age, before the degeneration of the secret schools. But this was rather an effort of Plato, who had been initiated, to establish in philosophy the truths of Orphicism. As H. P. B. observes, the downfall of the principal sanctuaries had already begun in Plato's time. (*Isis Unveiled* II, 305.) The Athenians probably refrained from speaking clearly of the charge against Socrates because this would involve mentioning the mystery teachings. The real offense

of Socrates was in teaching to his disciples the arcane doctrines of the Mysteries, betraying secrets which were "never to be revealed under the penalty of death." But Socrates had never been initiated and is hardly to be regarded as guilty of intentional profanation. For, as H. P. B. explains, "The old sage, in unguarded moments of 'spiritual inspiration,' revealed that which he had never learned; and was therefore put to death as an atheist." (*Isis Unveiled* II, 118.)

It seems just to observe that various other causes contributed to his condemnation. He had many enemies—among them the Athenian politicians whose faults he had exposed, and among the Sophists, whose ignorance and insincerity he had attacked. Everyone knew that Socrates thought the existing Athenian constitution was a complete failure. He had openly declared that the power of state should not be awarded by lot or election, but should be decided by the moral and intellectual qualifications of the candidates for office. But none of these reasons or all of them together, were sufficient cause for demanding his death. The charge of profanation alone provided a suitable pretext for his enemies. Even the initiate Aeschylus was accused of sacrilege and narrowly escaped being stoned to death because the Athenians believed he had exposed a portion of the Eleusinian teaching in his trilogies performed before the public.

The tragedy of Socrates teaches a mighty lesson as to the dangers of passivity, showing also the wisdom of the rule which does not permit the initiation of mediums. The medium delivers himself into the control of his "familiar spirit," and one who thus surrenders the sovereignty of self-control to an outside force can not be trusted to keep the rules of initiation—in particular, the rule of secrecy. Socrates was the victim of both himself and his times. His death was not, from the appearance of things, just; but in the larger view—the view which comprehends the working of Karma and the necessity of the Soul to learn from experience, it may have been precisely what was needed to awaken that noble ego from its passive tendencies.

"UNTHINKABLE AND UNSPEAKABLE"

Try as we may, we can never, limited as we are, approach the Absolute, which is to us, at our present state of mental development, merely a logical speculation, though dating back to thousands and thousands of years. —*Transactions.*

THE LIFE OF SOUL

ALL who think at all strive to solve the mystery of life and death. Nearly always men try to describe with images and analogies their conception of the integrated action of thought and will which commands the body. One, with hand outstretched toward the sky, will say, "I like to think that our life and our thought come to us like rays from the sun. When the body is not there for life to vivify—when death comes—the Life-rays shine through other bodies. But we do not survive. There is no individual life of the mind after death, nor any continuity of life for us."

Here is a great truth seen but partially. It is clear that the speaker conceives of himself as matter and body; thinks that he, the body, borrows for a time a kind of foreign illumination; that the identity which rules the body—which chooses certain thinking habits and discards others—is not, somehow, himself. The choosing principle is believed to end its existence with the stoppage of the brain function at death.

This identification of self with physical form comes from the perception that our consciousness seems to animate every cell of the body; yet although our sense of identity is deeply sunk within this citadel of flesh, even personal self-consciousness has no special physical localization. Harmony of thought is a description of the "Kingdom of Heaven" within, but where "within"? The confines of this kingdom are never found; its horizons reach far beyond the body, which seems to serve merely as the nerve-ending of gross sensation. The physical images brought to the eyes are mere lines. The context of meaning and beauty is an interpretative value constructed by the mind. By imagination we are able to understand the problems of utterly unknown peoples, and in some degree, to appreciate the stellar universe with the aid of abstract geometrical lines and formulas.

It is urged that our consciousness is so closely knit with every fibre of the body and every perception of sense that we are unable to separate Life and Self from body. But suddenly, from every cell, that mysterious warmth is abstracted in death. So far no one has been able to find the direction of its retreat, nor to harness that power anew—to cause by external means a new union of thinker with another body of flesh. The disappearance of the ego is as great an interior mystery as was its presence, for no microscope can

peer in upon the being which controls, suffers, and enjoys. We only *believe* that others suffer and enjoy, whereas we *know* our own suffering and enjoyment. Yet every man knows for himself, although he can not "prove" it, that he has the power to suffer and enjoy communion with some other mind. By what mechanism? By sensing that as we express our thoughts by sounds and movements, so the sounds and movement of others express their inner state. Mere words kindle no sympathy in us. Rapport or antipathy results from feeling that state of mind which shapes itself in verbal forms. The truth is that mind touches mind, that mind alone has created the mechanics necessary for this miracle.

Can we not see that our life is purely a life of the mind, that the functions of the body mean nothing save as we hold images in the mind which endow actions with meaning? It is possible to perform all purely bodily functions automatically, in a state of virtual unconsciousness. But it is hardly possible for us to think while "un"-conscious!

Obviously, we can not *know* Death—we cannot be conscious of a state of unconsciousness, if death is that. If the mind were aware of its own dissolution, it would not be dissolved. "Knowing" death would mean (for the materialist) to know and experience the sensations possible in a *dead* body. Although there is tremendous energy in a deserted body, it is but a riot of the disintegrating forces in the basic cell units, freed from the domination of the integrating intelligence. For this organizing consciousness to remain with the body as a witness of physical dissolution, mind would have to stand *apart* from the body in order to perceive it as an object. For the materialist, this is inconceivable: to be aware of death, a body-dependent mind would have to preserve its organizing dominion, and therefore the body would not be dead!

The awareness we feel to be our very self is no longer able to command the body as a coherent instrument after the latter suffers the changes we call Death. But when a globe fails to light because of some mechanical defect, can we assume that the electric current is no more? Scientific laboratories are constantly demonstrating how easily interchangeable are matter and energy. The study of matter and energy in their many complex relations is possible in the laboratory of the human body. Sleep is an illustration. In dreamless sleep, so far as we remember, our power to perceive seems trained against utter darkness, a void from which all objective forms are absent. Although we seem to behold nothing in deep sleep, the power to perceive makes passageway back through the

avenues of the senses, resuming the acts of waking, of speech and general reaction. What is this which travels so easily from the field of the undefined, the potential and energic side of nature, into the glove of flesh providing contact with the world of form and sense?

Those who have been subject to the medical employment of ether to induce abstraction from waking consciousness may obtain some perception of the nature of inner psychological states. The plunge of the man into a state removed from sense experience does not always bring complete unconsciousness at once. The personal mind, rushing to apparent annihilation, has its moment of extreme terror, of supreme effort to maintain awareness. It is said that suddenly, the capacity to feel becomes infinite, simultaneously with the removal of all external objects of feeling. Finally, with the passing of the effects of the ether upon the physical body, the consciouness returns by an irresistible attraction to the concrete limiting and protecting encasement of form. Those who have gone through this experience have had opportunity to learn at first hand that death, sleep, or unconsciousness lasts only until the passageway to embodied existence is unobstructed; to realize in themselves something of the promise that, "the man who has attained to the perfection of spiritual cultivation maintains his consciousness, alike while in the body, at the moment of quitting it, and when he has passed into higher spheres; and likewise when returning continues it unbroken while quitting higher spheres, when re-entering his body, and in resuming action on the material plane."

Organic and Inorganic

From one point of view, the distinguishing mark between what is called the organic and the inorganic is the function of nutrition, but if there were no nutrition how could those bodies which are called inorganic undergo change? Even crystals undergo a process of accretion, which for them answers the function of nutrition. In reality, as Occult philosophy teaches us, everything which changes is organic; it has the life principle in it, and it has all the potentiality of the higher lives. If, as we say, all in nature is an aspect of the one element, and life is universal, how can there be such a thing as an inorganic atom! —*Transactions.*

"WANT" AND "OUGHT"

EVERY student is keenly and painfully aware of the obstacles to be surmounted in his endeavors to apply the teachings of Theosophy practically.

"What ought I to do?" — in this, that, and the other situation — is the constantly recurring question. The employe asks it. The employer asks it, and so on in all the relations of human life.

It is not a question anyone can answer for another—in the way the answer is usually desired. That desire is almost always specific on the part of the questioner, and there are always more than enough of those ready to give specific reply: "Do this. Don't do that."

When this solution is examined, more than one truly occult obstacle becomes visible. Any direction of this kind is a *commandment,* nothing at all in the way of that advice and instruction which should inspire the student in asking, the one besought in replying. It is simply and plainly a remnant, a *skandha* of the Jehovah complex.

"What *ought* I to do?" The question is moral, not simply intellectual or psychic, and therefore calls first of all for self-examination. To ask another to decide for us is to vacate our own sense of responsibility. The question is proper enough from a child, but even here we can learn something. It is very doubtful if anyone ever heard a child propound an inquiry involving the moral "ought." The child asks, "May I do this?" If the responsible reply should be "No," the child will usually rejoin, *"Why not?"*

This is because in the child the principle of desire is uppermost, therefore positive and active, while the principle of responsibility is dormant or negative. Not till the higher principles are "awake" in the body, not till *Manas* begins to dispute the sovereignty of Desire, does the *spiritual* being begin its "struggle for life."

For a long period, often for the whole earthly existence, Manas is deceived into the attempt to "reason" with Desire. The Animal or psychic nature is devoid of reason; it knows what it wants—and wants it *now.* It never asks nor seeks anything but ways and means to the accomplishment of its desires. Those desires may be harmless, may be even "good" in the sense that the psychic nature is instinctively aware of what it needs as well as of what it wants, but being devoid of reason is unable to distinguish between what it *requires* for its sustenance and what it *wants.* Thus, in the human being the principle of Desire, or *Kama,* is an intermediate, a larval

form or state of consciousness. No animal or "elemental" has any "desires" in the human sense of this term. It has only "instinct"—a form of perception well worth thoughtful study. Instinct is Spiritual Knowledge in the kingdoms below the human, and is infallible *on its own plane.*

Manas, likewise, is spiritual knowledge on a higher plane than the human, as is *Buddhi* on the Universal plane. Thus there are possible three distinct forms or aspects of perfect knowledge—the knowledge of what is really good to do or to refrain from doing.

Until the student learns to distinguish between instinct, desire, reason, and Duty or Responsibility—the four planes of human life—he will inevitably mistake one for the other, and will yield to the influence of whichever of these principles happens to be uppermost. Nothing is more ferocious than Desire or Aversion when it is uppermost; nothing more placid when it has achieved its object. Witness the tiger or other predatory beast concentrated on the "kill," and the same beast after its appetite has been glutted.

Desire in man is the same wild beast, only a thousandfold more deadly when Reason becomes its slave. This can only be when Duty or Responsibility is blinded. How is it blindfolded? By "reasoning" with one's desires. The "Thou shalts" and the "Thou shalt nots" of life have their proper place and field only in dealing with Desire and desires. There is no room for "argument" here. Spirit is as blind on the plane of matter as matter is blind on the plane of spirit. Who would appeal to the "moral sense" of an animal? Who would waste time or energy to reason with a beast?

What we have to learn, then, is to recognize *the beast in man,* and this whether the creature is by nature docile or resistant. Either we must subdue the beast to our purposes or succumb to servitude ourselves.

The "Higher Self," *Atma-Buddhi,* is *blind* on the plane of human life—blind in the same sense that a seeing man is blind in pitch darkness. *Manas,* the reasoning Principle, is the sole light here of the Higher Self. If the Light of Manas is colored by Desire, then Atma-Buddhi "sees red": the Divine Principle becomes the Destroyer instead of the Preserver.

What causes crime—in the individual, in the nation, in the race? Manas, *Self-consciousness,* which has not yet learned that no man can serve two Masters, but "reasons" that he can compromise between God and Mammon, between Duty and desire, between Responsibility and irresponsibility.

POWERS OF MIND

> Now the evolution of the *external* form or body round the *astral* is produced by the terrestrial forces, just as in the case of the lower kingdoms; but the evolution of the internal or real MAN is purely spiritual. It is now no more a passage of the impersonal Monad through many and various forms of matter —endowed at best with instinct and consciousness on quite a different plane—as in the case of external evolution, but a journey of the "pilgrim-soul" through various *states* of *not only matter* but Self-consciousness and self-perception, or of *perception* from apperception. (*The Secret Doctrine* I, 175.)

THE idea of an internal, *spiritual* evolution through various states of self-consciousness and self-perception is the missing link of both science and religion, and, therefore, the key to all the perplexing mysteries of life, today as in the past. Before we can understand evolution (or "salvation," to use a religious term), we must know something about the nature of the unit which evolves. Before we can set an objective for the common achievement of mankind we have to be aware of the various possibilities of human evolution, both collectively and individually. The trouble with most theories of progress, whether religious or scientific, is that the objective of life is described in ignorance of man's true nature, and then the definition of man is forced into an artificial consistency with that objective. The average man of religion, for example, would like to be "saved" without making the necessary effort. Consequently the priests have been quick to invent doctrines of divine grace, of vicarious atonement, of salvation by faith—all ideas which require the dogma of original sin. The idea of self as a creature is demanded by the idea of God as creator. Given the theological assumptions as to the nature of self and Deity, the resulting doctrines of Christianity are unavoidable conclusions. There is inexorable logic in the Catholic doctrine which says, in the words of a modern apologist,

> It is to the credit of ancient Christendom that an injury done to the common good of the temporal order in its subordination to eternal values was felt to be of its nature a graver hurt than a more obvious wrong that affected it only in the order of temporal things. In one sense a State which was prepared to inflict death for the crime of heresy showed a greater concern for the good of souls and a nobler conception of the dignity of

> human society (thus centered on truth) than a state which only punishes for crimes committed against the body.[1]

If choosing for one's self in the matter of religious ideas leads to damnation, then death at the stake is the supreme service to the heretic. According to Catholic doctrine, one who wilfully denies that God is a person, who believes that in the words of other men there is knowledge equal to or greater than that taught by Jesus, who does not admit the saving efficacy of the sacraments—and, worst of all, he who deliberately refuses to acknowledge the sanctifying offices of the Roman Catholic Church, is irrevocably damned. Hence intolerance to the extent of actual extermination of heretics, lest others be corrupted, is a sacred duty of the believer.

It is quite plain that acceptance of these ideas is dependent on the primary doctrine of man's originally sinful nature and of his helplessness without the saving intervention of the personal deity through the agency of the "Son." This is why the Church has been so consistent in declaring anathemas against those who have in any way questioned or denied man's inherent weakness. The major heresies were all concerned with the essential nature of man, or they had consequences dangerous to the ideas of a personal God, the uniqueness of the Son, or the authority of Rome. Pelagius, for example, denied the original sin, thus eliminating the necessity for divine grace. What need, then, for a church which claimed to be the sole source on earth of that grace? The Pelagian heresy was condemned at Carthage, A. D. 416. Arius, somewhat more consistent than Rome with the Gnostic doctrine of emanations, asserted that there was a time when the Son or *Logos* was not, *i.e.*, "unmanifested." Arius and his followers were condemned in 325 A. D. at the Council of Nicea. The Macedonians made a similar objection to the ranking of the Holy Ghost with the "Father," alleging that this member of the trinity was a creation (an "emanation," rather), like the angels. This heresy was condemned at the first Council of Constantinople, A. D. 381. The Nestorians, among other things, denied that Mary was the "Mother of God," maintaining that she was parent only of the human aspect of the savior. The Nestorians were condemned at the Council of Ephesus, 431 A. D.

A study of the history of organized Christianity shows the inevitable fate of a religion which strives for temporal power. Augustine, whose thought became the basis for Christian theology, gradually succumbed to the specious ideal of the worldly success of

[1] Jacques Maritain, *Freedom in the Modern World* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1936), p. 67.

the church. At first disapproving of the persecution of heretics, he later admitted its practical necessity in establishing Christianity as the unquestioned spiritual authority. His arguments have been repeated in countless forms by the apologists for the Roman Church, and by Protestant persecutors as well. If God is served by burning—*burn.*

For ages Christians have been crucified by their definition of man as weak, sinful, helpless. To honor an outside God is to dishonor and degrade humanity. From the point of view of Karma and Reincarnation, one of the most important questions a theosophist can ask himself is, Why, in the early centuries of our era, did this idea take such fast root in the western mind?

As with religion, the difficulties, contradictions and misleading character of modern scientific theory are the logical outcome of an erroneous idea of self. The belief that man is an evolution of the animal kingdom is as firmly held among scientists as the doctrine of the original sin among religionists. On behalf of science, however, it must be said that the perpetuation and support of this idea have been the result of honest conviction, whereas religious dogma represents the hypocrisy and self-interest of priestcraft. But sincerity can mitigate only partially the effect of ignorance. The logic of scientific thought proceeds on the assumption that man is an animal to consequences almost as baleful as religious dogma. As divine revelation in the parable of the separation of the wheat from the tares was made the justification for the murder of countless innocents, so the scientific revelation of biology — the doctrine of heredity as a predestining power—has become the justification for "blood purges" and obligatory sterilization. Fortunately, obscurities in the mechanism of heredity, such as the discovery that "genes" are not the immutable units they were once supposed, give the saner of geneticists pause. Similarly, numerous theologians have been doubtful of the proper interpretation of the "proof text" of persecution, the parable of the wheat and the tares. Much of the polemical writing of the Reformation centered about this problem, just as the polemics of eugenics and racism examine the evidences of biology.

A striking illustration of both the power and the limitations of the rational process is provided by the thought of those who are striving to understand modern problems without going beyond the context of scientific assumption. Dr. Trigant Burrow, head of the Lifwynn Foundation in New York, has the almost inconceivable distinction of being a psycho-analyst who admits that he is himself

the victim of "conditionings." In *The Social Basis of Consciousness* he describes the incident which was responsible for this realization. A student Dr. Burrow had been analyzing demanded that their positions be reversed—that he, the student, have an opportunity to psycho-analyze the master. Indulgently Dr. Burrow agreed, but was horrified to discover that his growing personal resistance to the process soon made the examination insufferable; he found the proprietary and authoritarian attitude of his erstwhile student infinitely offensive, coming to see that it had been precisely the same attitude in himself which had aroused similar objections in his former subject. Dr. Burrow honestly concluded that the chair of the analyst is a mere symbol of authority, the assumption of which does not automatically endow its occupant with any real knowledge. The feeling of authority, he began to perceive, is an illusion founded on nothing more substantial than the "unconscious" mind—the psychological net-work of non-rational ideas. He realized that the habit of authority tends to obscure real ignorance—ignorance which in his own case became exposed as emotional instability when he exchanged places with his subject. Thus he is led to make this extraordinary admission:

> It has not yet been recognized . . . that we who are psychoanalysts are ourselves theorists, that we also are very largely misled by an unconscious that is social, that we too are neurotic, in so far as every expression but that of life in its native simplicity is neurotic. Our disharmony . . . is a phase of that widely diffused neurosis that exists under the prevailing social concensus represented in its normal adaptation. As with others, who have been inured to a curriculum of daily adaptation from the impressionable years of earliest childhood, so with ourselves; it is well nigh impossible to study the virgin soil of consciousness from our present adaptive premise without vitiating our conclusions with the bias of our own adaptation.[2]

More recently Dr. Burrow developed this idea by suggesting that "man can only acquire an acquaintance with his own intrinsic behavior processes through an appreciation of himself by himself."[3] Our view of man, he thinks, must be freed of the conditionings of tradition. "Not what we look *at* only, but what we look *from* is decisive in determining what we shall see." Man must be stripped bare of his artificial structure of ideas about himself. Then he can

---

[2] *The Social Basis of Consciousness* (New York: Harcourt & Brace, 1927), pp. 17, 52.
[3] "Altering Frames of Reference in the Sphere of Human Behavior," *Journal of Social Philosophy,* January, 1937.

see clearly and understand his conduct. The "overlay" of environment must be removed:

> . . . what we call the individual is by no means the fresh and native expression of individuality pure and simple that we are accustomed to assume, rather . . . he is an individuation resulting from the repressive forces acting upon him from the environmental social aggregate in which he is himself but an intrinsic and contributory element. For every individual arising amid the influences of the social system is but a special application of the social system about him. Whatever the code of the consensus, the individual is necessarily but an offprint of it.[4]

With this we may compare a statement of H. P. B.:

> Outside of initiation, the ideals of contemporary religious thought must always have their wings clipped and remain unable to soar higher; for idealistic as well as realistic thinkers, and even free-thinkers, are but the outcome and the natural product of their respective environments and periods. The ideals of both are only the necessary result of their temperaments, and the outcome of that phase of intellectual progress to which a nation, in its collectivity, has attained . (*S. D.* I, 326-7.)

Note that except for the words, "Outside of initiation," the two statements are virtually identical. Yet all evolution proceeds as the general result of initiation, and human progress receives its only impetus in this way. The evolution of the real man is through states of consciousness—it is purely spiritual. This is the first principle from which the subsequent doctrines of Theosophical philosophy are developed. Dr. Burrow's theory of the nature of man leads him in exactly the opposite direction. He might be described as the Rousseau of the philosophy of biology. He calls man's thinking largely symbolical, illustrating this by the fact that one can enjoy the beauties of nature as represented in a poem without having contact with nature at the time of the enjoyment. This mental life in terms of symbols, he thinks, has been progressively substituted for the primary existence of man as a physical organism and has "now become the order of man's behavior throughout the species." The psychic and intellectual life of humanity, in his view, is made up of a vast collection of conditioned reflexes, which is differentiated into clusters of smaller systems. As Dr. Burrow puts it:

> We have, for example, such clusters as the British Empire, the Catholic Church, or students of behavior disorders, but each cluster, the one political the other religious, the third psychotherapeutic, represents a system of socially conditioned reflexes.

---

[4] *The Social Basis of Consciousness*, p. 70.

> . . . Within the nationally conditioned system of index-reflexes . . . there may be such sub-classes as capitalists, communists or socialists; within the ecclesiastical group we find such socially conditioned divisions as religious orders, the secular and lay communities; among psychotherapists we find groups of such widely differing conditionings as the Freudians, the Behaviorists or the descriptive psychologists. Yet in these various parties . . . it is assumed that the individuals composing such clusters have formed their affiliations in accord with what is their choice or liking. But, on the basis of the organism's partial reactions, what the individual "likes" is really his response to an index-reflex that is socially conditioned and that socially conditions him. In his likes as in his dislikes the individual is really subject, not agent. He is conditioned, not free.[5]

Dr. Burrow waxes indignant in his indictment of the various instruments which society has evolved for the correction of our social problems. "Right" and "wrong" are values which derive wholly from artificial conditionings—"Is it any wonder, then," he asks, "that we get nowhere in our criminal courts as in our international disputes in the absence of a more stabilized criterion for determining the dependable basis of motivation in man's behavior-processes?" His final judgment is this:

> In every other sphere of science its criteria rest upon the determination of a primary element or first principle as the indispensable basis of dependable scientific investigation. In the domain of man's behavior-processes, on the contrary, secondarily conditioned reflexes have in their overt expression arbitrarily taken the place of the organism's primary principle of motivation and have thus precluded a dependable basis of scientific observation and adjudication.[6]

Let us summarize Dr. Burrow's basic ideas, for in logical consistency he stands head and shoulders above most of his contemporaries. He calls, first, for self-knowledge. He points to the complete relativism, socially speaking, of good and evil. He recognizes that most of what passes for knowledge is merely psychological illusion, a catalogue of *names* which describe effects. (What could be truer than this observation: "Psychiatric and welfare work students still maintain a frame of reference that permits them to talk of the symptomatic indices or appearances that *symbolize* disorder and do nothing about the internal maladjustments that *are the disorder.*") Finally, he points to the futility of trying to understand human

[5] "Altering Frames of Reference." [6] *Ibid.*

behavior and social problems so long as such investigation lacks a fundamental guiding principle.

The remarkable thing about Dr. Burrow's discussion of these questions is that after having established so clearly the principles of intelligent research, he adopts the position of complete materialism. For him, man is a physical organism; all psychic phenomena arise from conditionings of the body; the life of the mind is a vast epiphenomenal reflection of bodily processes and has no existence as an independent factor in behavior. The problem of normal living as of the correction of disorders is to be solved by tracing the causes of behavior to their roots in the organism; our only recourse, he says, "lies in re-integrating ourselves within this sovereign, internal principle of motivation."

Dr. Burrow believes that his colleagues in psychological research are all misled by verbalization, talk, and "psychic ratiocination" in terms of mere symbols of the real. He even admits that at one time both he and his present associates were victims of these delusions:

> We too, of course, set out upon our group investigations from the same verbal, psychic, extra-organic premise, and from the basis of this false premise we were in the beginning completely impervious to any other position. Nothing availed to offset this tendency to personal and social bias except the daily routine of actual experimentation with processes which are intra-organic and which, possessing depth and dimension in relation to the organism as a whole, called definitely for an altered frame of reference in respect to man's behavior-processes as internally perceived by us.[7]

In the light of these statements, it is not difficult to understand why H. P. B. said that reason is a Chinese wall slowly rising on the soil of sophistry, which finally shuts out man's spiritual perceptions. (*Isis* I, 145.) The meaning of the passage in *The Voice of the Silence,* "The Mind is the great Slayer of the Real," also becomes quite clear. Dr. Burrow's conclusions illustrate the power of intellect *"when placed under the inflence or control of material conditions."* (S. D. I, 292.) Quite obviously, he does not even suspect that the doctrine that man is an animal is itself a frame of reference by which he is "conditioned," and that this erroneous view could only be fortified by a "daily routine of actual experimentation" which proceeds under the assumptions of materialism. For Dr. Burrow, the lighting up of Manas would mark the beginning

[7] *Ibid.*

of a mass hallucination of mankind, causing men to suppose that there is a life of the mind apart from the body.

It should be evident that the way back to the view of man quoted from *The Secret Doctrine* at the beginning of these considerations will be a long and tortuous path for the scientist whom good logic on false premises has led so far astray. Only the shock of phenomena in direct and irrefutable demonstration that the mind can operate *in liberation from the bonds of matter* will ever persuade the materialist of his great mistake. Some of the manifestations of mind independent of matter are—(*a*) Clairvoyance, (*b*) Psychometry. (*S. D.* I, 292.) The vast wave of psychic phenomena which swept the world a hundred years ago was turned to good purpose by H. P. B. in the service of such a shock to scientific materialism. Some few leaders in science availed themselves of the lesson of spiritualism, and the testimony of men like A. R. Wallace and William Crookes did much to leaven the thought of their time. Materialism, however, is still the entrenched orthodoxy, which nullifies almost completely the humanitarian striving of every sincere scientist in the fields of sociology. Further shocks are needed, and will come; but this time it is to be hoped that a further incarnation of *Manas* will accompany the psychic renaissance, leading to knowledge of the true science of mind, and, perchance, to a view of human evolution as "a journey of the 'pilgrim soul' through various *states* of *not only matter* but Self-consciousness and self-perception."

Atomic Principles

An atom may be compared to (and is for the Occultist) the seventh principle of a body or rather of a molecule. The physical or chemical molecule is composed of an infinity of finer molecules and these in their turn of innumerable and still finer molecules. Take for instance a molecule of iron and so resolve it that it becomes non-molecular; it is then, at once transformed into one of its seven principles, *viz.,* its astral body; the seventh of these is the atom. The analogy between a molecule of iron, before it is broken up, and this same molecule after resolution, is the same as that between a physical body before and after death. The principles remain *minus* the body. Of course this is occult alchemy, not modern chemistry. —*Transactions.*

BUDDHI: KAMA

THE prolonged alchemical distillation that is the disciple-life is not aided by violent fluctuations of temperature. Such psychological "fevers" especially afflict those whose concern is about the "good" or "evil," the "progress" or lack of progress they see in their own natures.

We are yet too much burdened by the religious residues of "sin" and "remorse" and their correspondences of "goodness" and "happiness," which after all are only the old "pairs of opposites," both useful for learning simply because they *are* opposites. "Conviction of sin" is blood-brother to desire for reward in heaven, and neither permits of self-knowledge. The "good" are nowhere so near the goal as the man who can calmly regard his own human nature without being upset by its contrast with what he wishes were there. One is helped to this impersonality by seeing himself as a small cross-section of the Universal and by regarding motivations in their cosmic aspect.

Let us then look into the generation and descent of the vast urges which now exhibit themselves as movers of the end-organs of Self currently called "men." The universal and formless *Buddhi*—creative desire to transcend the ring "Pass Not," whether of objective or subjective conditioning—is now exceedingly remote from ordinary human experience, although it may be sensed in moments when unnamable yearnings arise, feelings for which the mind can formulate no object and no image. But it was this Desire that drew across the material emptiness of the Universe the first faint gauzy curtain of primordial substance—the idea of privation of primordial substance, rather. The nearest correlative of that "substance" conceivable to the human mind is our own inner principle, "Buddhi," a word printed often enough in the books and referred to in discourse, but actually *known* only in rare moments of great sacrifice or in interludes of silence when earthly vibrations are briefly quiescent.

From the ineffable One, Cosmic Desire reached *outward and downward,* questing in diversity for knowledge of unity. In successive stages, Desire caused forms and modes of experience, which were woven out of the substantial aspect of itself; and so, step by step, our present manifested world came into being.

For half the cycle the divine *ecstasis* is creative, moving toward experience of the self in diversity; in the latter half is the return of

the soul to divinity. It is toward that high state that our noblest aspirations rise: this is Buddhi. Toward self-knowledge first reached Universal Desire—*outward*. And though the object then and the object now was and is the same, the power that then moved outward was Buddhi, transforming itself into *Kama* in the uprising tide of material evolution. Now, in those who aspire, it is Kama striving to rebecome Buddhi. This ought to bring calmness into that struggle which is implied and often confused by such expressions as the "higher and lower self," "the suppression of desire," and the like. For what we deal with in all circumstances are simply variant aspects of the *one* power in its centripetal and centrifugal directions.

"Good and evil," "higher and lower," are merely matters of times and periods, combinations, permutations and results thereof, in terms of pleasure and pain. There was no question of matter being "earthly, sensual, and devilish" to the Egos of the race awakening from Nirvana. We hastened to drink of each new mode of matter evolved with the same joyous abandon seen in children plunging into festival, with no thought of "sin." The like is seen today in savages, many of them white, who engage without qualm or misgiving in indulgences that would mean ultimate degradation for a man with a civilized conscience. But in the beginning of the great cycle of incarnation, only two classes of beings knew either detachment, restraint, or misgiving: the reluctant Nirvanees who recognized the traps that lie in desire, but who lacked responsibility toward the living instruments of desire's satisfaction; and those who had in the past learned both lessons. The former, through lack of compassion and neglect of duty, now have become the Egos of our race, caught in the terrible throes of mental suffering; to the latter is owing all the world knows of wisdom, spirituality, and the possibility of ultimate release.

When the limit of descent into materiality—hence the ultimate sensitivity to material sensation—is reached for our cycle, then the centripetal power sets in; Buddhi ceases transforming itself into Kama to fit every new form of manifestation, for manifestation is to go no farther. Kama then must transform itself into Buddhi on the upward cycle. But Man was, is and will be, rooted in Primordial Reality through all phases and moments of the cycle, even in experiencing delights of matter: in his lower nature he is the victim of Kama, one who has lost all reminiscence of the Buddhic fire; in his spiritual aspect he is Buddhi that has never lost its pristine condition. Thus he is both the observer and the field of battle of Buddhi evolved and centrifugal, and Buddhi reinvolved and centri-

petal. At the crisis of the great cosmic sweep, he is the metaphysical meeting-ground of the irresistible force and the immovable body; this is the moment of choice, of polarization. As a planet, we have just passed the nadir; as a race, we are close to the point of ultimate balance, and dreadful is the battle. Buddhi, become Kama, is infinite in its outward separative tendency, infinite in its power to disguise itself as the highest good, subtle in its persuasion to the rationalizing aspect of man's nature; diabolical in its whisper that indulgence in this or that, just this once more, would leave us henceforth untortured by desire.

Myriads of lives, countless fierce but brief joys, numberless fiercer but not so brief pains, and perpetual disappointments, are too often required before a man learns that the Kamic drink is salt and that its assuagements lead but to oblivion; before he learns the searing nature of this fire which burns him to the bone every time he approaches close enough to feel its warmth.

We learn, it seems, chiefly from the bitterness of first-hand experience, although it need not be so. Had a man retained his wisdom during the long descent into matter, or if he could regain it now, it would not take long for him to see, even in the midst of life, that *happiness is not due to the fulfillment, but to the absence of desire.* Fulfillment satisfies only fleetingly, only partially, with disappointment, and with the resurgence of greater desire. *The nature of Self is Bliss*—the bliss of wholeness; wanting things is the only destroyer of its continuity. Why? Because all objects are but broken mirrors reflecting the potencies of the very Self that seeks; the light can never be approached by going toward the darkness where are fixed the mirrors of its reflections.

Only in realizing this can man separate in himself his Buddhic and Kamic propensities; his centripetal from his centrifugal tendencies. Only so can he tell the real from the unreal; love from lust, energy from anger, use of possessions from desire of possessions. Until he learns this, powers and possessions, lovers and friends, will be but reflected lights, Will-o'-the-Wisps leading away from instead of guiding toward the Real.

H. P. B. ON "MEMORY"

[This explanation of the part played by the brain in memory appeared in *Lucifer,* IX, p. 122, as a note by H. P. B. on an article she had translated from the Russian, "The Diary of an Old Physician," by Dr. N. I. Pirogoff.—Editors.]

NOTHING that takes place, no manifestation however rapid or weak, can ever be lost from the *Skandhic* record of a man's life. Not the smallest sensation, the most trifling action, impulse, thought, impression, or deed, can fade or go out from, or in the Universe. We may think it unregistered by our memory, unperceived by our consciousness, yet it will still be recorded on the tablets of the astral light. Personal memory is a fiction of the physiologist. There are cells in our brain that receive and convey sensations and impressions, but this once done, their mission is accomplished. These cells of the supposed "organ of memory" are the *receivers* and *conveyors* of all the pictures and impressions of the past, not their *retainers.* Under various conditions and stimuli, they can receive instantaneously the reflection of these astral images back again, and this is called *memory, recollection, remembrance;* but they do not preserve them. When it is said that one has lost his memory, or that it is weakened, it is only a *façon de parler;* it is our memory-cells alone that are enfeebled or destroyed. The window glass allows us to see the sun, moon, stars, and all the objects outside clearly; crack the pane and all these outside images will be seen in a distorted way; break the window-pane altogether and replace it with a board, or draw the blind down, and the images will be shut out altogether from your sight. But can you say because of this, that all these images—sun, moon, and stars—have disappeared, or that by repairing the window with a new pane, the same will not be reflected again into your room? There are cases on record of long months and years of insanity, of long days of fever when almost everything done or said, was done and said unconsciously. Yet when the patients recovered they remembered occasionally their words and deeds and very fully. *Unconscious* cerebration is a phenomenon on this plane and may hold good so far as the personal mind is concerned. But the Universal Memory preserves every motion, the slightest wave and feeling that ripples the waves of differentiated nature, of man or of the Universe.

YOUTH-COMPANIONS' FORUM

WHY *do we not make most of our progress between lifetimes, when we do not make mistakes but are drawn automatically in the right direction?*

(*a*) The after-death states are not active states like the incarnated life on earth where the full septenary man works in a world of contrasts. The nature of both Kama Loka and Devachan is determined by the thoughts and psychic forces set up in earth-life. These subjective states offer no contrasts, Devachan being the domain of spiritual effects. Mr. Judge states in the *Ocean* that the dream of Devachan is gradually exhausted in proportion as the psychic impulses of earth-life die away. So it can be seen there is not the opportunity for learning after death.

Nor is Devachan ultimately desirable. If we learn and assimilate the experiences of each day we live on earth, then Devachan becomes unnecessary. For the student of Theosophy who tries to fit himself to be the better able to help and teach others, Devachan seems a waste of precious time. His very longing to be here among his fellow men, trying to help them understand the truths of the ancient Wisdom-Religion, would perhaps draw him back to work in the service of others.

(*b*) In Devachan we are busy with the loftiest dreams, the highest imaginings of the life just lived, but when these are compared with the true ideal of man's destiny and the marvelous process by which that destiny is fulfilled, these imaginings and dreams are seen to be merely personal longings, even selfish. They fall far below what humanity needs at our hands. In Devachan we do not struggle against our weakness, do not strive to help the troubles of humanity, are not even moved by the suffering of those who were dear to us in the last life. We no longer remember anything unpleasant.

Mr. Judge writes, "Both states (earth-life and Devachan) are out of the true, while the Ego who is the real witness, sees the lower personality struggling with these phantoms while it, whether the body be living or its other parts be in devachan, enjoys eternal felicity. It sits on high unmoved, immovable." (THEOSOPHY IV, 30.) He makes it clear that it is the spiritual nature above the psychic which remains unaffected by all personal states.

In Devachan we work out our unfinished business and when we return to birth, we come with the strength we have gained while

resting. It is here in life where true progress is made; here we pick up again the tendencies of former births, bad as well as good; here we are confronted with the pairs of opposites, with duality on every hand; here we exercise our divine power of choice and spin the web of our own destiny. Here, where we err, we make amends, and here, where we strive for good, we shall progress.

Should we, as Theosophists, bear arms in the event of war?

(*a*) A Theosophist who went to war might be in a position to do a great deal of good among his fellow soldiers. His knowledge of that old treatise on war, *The Bhagavad-Gita,* his understanding of the meaning of death and the importance of duty, his conception of honor—all these he might share with other men called with him to the duty of war.

The bearing of arms is a very old calling and some of us may have entered it by choice in past ages. To have to serve now, when we see war in a different light, may be the working out of some ancient tendency. In "Karmic Visions" (THEOSOPHY III, 544), H. P. B. describes a prince who loves peace and is determined that when he rules, his people shall have no more war. But as king he finds himself head of an army of soldiers who demand that he lead them into action. The article reveals him as having been a ruthless warrior in a past incarnation.

A Theosophist would try to understand so far as possible just what is involved in the war. He might ask himself: What are the real principles at stake in this war? Is it my duty to fight, although I think that my country is pursuing a course contrary to the good of humanity? Is my country karmically connected with this conflict, or is it interfering in the affairs of others? Is it my duty to volunteer, or have I a greater duty at home? — a greater duty to take an individual stand against war, come what may? Is the fear of what others may say entering into my decision?

A Theosophist might go to war knowing that war is an effect brought about by causes set into motion in the past, and that it is like the bursting forth of poisons lodged in a human organism. The system can not be healed by driving the poisons back into the body. He would go to war knowing that in the final analysis, greed and selfishness in the individuals making up the nation are at the root of war. The conflict raging in each man between his higher and his lower self ultimately finds expression in upheaval and cataclysm. Rage, jealousy, fear and intemperance of all kinds, the willingness to profit at the expense of others, indifference to the welfare of others, hatred of those who injure us, and favoritism—all these

exist throughout society. The cumulative effect of such attitudes and feelings brings war. A Theosophist bearing arms might be able to satisfy not only individual Karma but race and national Karma if he went through the ordeal *as a Theosophist.*

But Theosophy requires the application of *principles* in every case, and so it gives no final answer to any particular question. *The Friendly Philosopher* says:

> In considering a question bearing on the ethics of any case, we have first to be sure that we have no prejudices or preconceptions that can interfere with correct conclusions; in other words, "to be free from hard and fast conclusions as to men, things and methods." If we are thus free, we will not be liable to be swayed by the general classifications of good and evil, so common in the world, and the great error of the churches. The way is then open for the real point at issue, which to me is *not* what is done, but *why* was it done—the motive. Now who can answer this but the one who acts? If the act appears to him as a duty, and a proper one, he alone has paramount power, and there should be none to question a right to perform duty as it is seen and understood. It might very well be that another's acts would be improper for us, because of our different attitude; it might also be that our acts, seemingly proper to us, would to that other seem improper. From these considerations it would seem fair to deduce that the only correct sanction, and the one we should seek, would come from within.
>
> Of course, different attitudes of mind produce different actions in any given case. Those who have knowledge will not act from the same motive as those who have less knowledge or none. Those who have no knowledge act under the impulse of the common attitude or way of doing things. Those who are wise naturally take all possible results into consideration from their wider point of view, before acting. With them it is largely a question of duty, unswayed by what the views of others may be, except in so far as those views might interfere with larger duties and influence at other times. In fact, so many things have to be taken into consideration possible to be seen and applied by the person alone who is involved, that no direct answer can be given in any particular case. General principles may be stated, and each individual left to apply them as he sees fit. In no other way can progress be made. We have finally, in any case, to determine whether we are swayed by inclination rather than plain duty, in order that we may not deceive ourselves. Whatever, then, is decided in all honesty with ourselves, is our duty, and no man is our judge (p. 39).

(*b*) The question is, Do theosophists believe in war? It seems as if the answer must depend upon what is at stake. In a revolt

against a government which has tried to suppress the primary rights of its citizens, they would certainly fight and do it well, maybe. However, if their nation declared war on some other people solely to protect the properties of commercial interests, I should think they would refuse to fight. One might ask himself, "Is it my duty in this case to murder my fellowman? Because it is my Karma to be born in this nation, must I kill to the best of my ability?" If he "must," similar reasoning might dictate that because one lives in a nation that grabs all it can while the getting is good, that *he* should do likewise! A state of war makes greater demands on conscience than lip service. It is easy to live, breathe, and die for the good of the whole, when this is done in theory. A true warrior in the battle the *Gita* depicts may earn nothing but contempt and accusations of cowardice from most of his fellow citizens because he refuses to take part in the mass murder which has been justified by false patriotism. Duties are various, and courage has its lower and higher forms.

(*c*) In Volume VI of THEOSOPHY, page 145, there is an article, "How are the Theosophists to Look at the War?" The occasion for this article was the last World War. Answering the question, it states:

> You ask how Theosophists are to look at the war; well, they have to look at it as it is. They did not make it; and they have to set theories aside and face *the condition* wisely.

A number of Theosophists took part in that war. Some were in the thick of the battle. Others had work back of the lines. Others did not leave their country. All tried to *face the condition wisely*. They knew that the causes of the war involved both Karma and Reincarnation, and took that basis in their action.

Some wars are for the "preservation of the just, the destruction of the wicked and the establishment of righteousness." We should remember that it may be necessary to fight the devil with fire, which he understands, and not holy water, which means nothing to him.

One is a citizen of his country through his own choice in this life or through Karma of the past. Sometimes it is best to abide by the laws of the country, in other words, to "render unto Caesar that which is Caesar's." But in whatever position we are, we can maintain our inner attitude.

If there should be a war in which our country engaged, say a war of oppression, and we were compelled to fight by its laws, certainly we can consider and know that our country is wrong. We

can protest to the limit of our powers. If we do all we can, we can do no more.

A war must be considered from all these aspects; we can not classify our action in regard to all wars.

The Co-operative Movement has met with great success in many parts of Europe and in certain parts of the United States. Is not this a good, practical way of bringing about the goal of Theosophy?

(*a*) To be truly co-operative one should know the fundamental nature and laws of the universe in which he lives. Then he knows that brotherhood is actually a fact, not alone among men, but in all nature.

As motive determines the moral quality of any act, and discrimination determines whether the act is wise or foolish, so with many individuals working in "cooperation"—their average motive and discrimination in the work determine its value.

We can to some extent judge the co-operative movement by its fruits. If, as in Sweden and Denmark, co-operative societies have reduced want, lowered prices for the great mass of men, and yet have not interfered unfairly with individual enterprise, they are obviously of value. If any movement, however, is discriminatory against others, then it is not co-operative and must ultimately bring disharmony.

Nor have all co-operative brotherhoods been successful, because to practice brotherhood wisely, knowledge of principles is necessary. Mere "isms" can achieve only temporary success, if at all. What H. P. B. says in *The Key to Theosophy* with reference to political reforms may be applied to any organized movement: "To seek to achieve political reforms before we have effected a reform in *human nature, is like putting new wine* into old bottles."

We cannot see how co-operative movements will bring about the goal of Theosophy, which is to raise the Buddhi-Manas of the race. This means working in the spiritual or causal field of action, from which all beneficial effects must flow. What this kind of effort will do for life among men here is also shown in the *Key:* "Slowly but surely it will burst asunder the iron fetters of creeds and dogmas, of social and caste prejudices; it will break down racial and national antipathies and barriers, and will open the way to the practical realization of the Brotherhood of all men." (P. 242.)

(*b*) Experiments in co-operatives have been tried by the hundred in America, most of them ending in failure. Some are being conducted now and may expect nothing but sympathy from Theoso-

phists. However, they can not be considered a practical way of achieving the goal of Theosophy; education in the meaning and importance of the general welfare and an understanding of fundamental principles alone can bring about a *natural* return of old and true systems. The goal of Theosophy is not a system, and can not be reached through any system. The goal of Theosophy lies hidden in the hearts of men, and the best way to reach it is set forth by those who understand human nature and divine nature better than any economist. They have indicated that the clear teaching of Theosophical principles is second to none as the means of bringing about the establishment of universal brotherhood.

In Sweden, where peaceful evolution in co-operatives has taken place, it is interesting that the experiment was preceded by one hundred years of social education. Co-operatives are very ancient, and decadent traces of them are to be found among almost all remnants of dying civilizations, from the Eskimo to the hill tribes of India. Archeologists find unmistakable evidence of their existence in prehistoric America and among the ancient communities of Asia and Africa. The sincere but futile experiments in co-operatives carried on by the American colonists should satisfy the student that it is philosophy that is needed, not *systems*. The repeated failure of Utopian theories throughout historical times offers evidence that Theosophy is right in contending that education in the meaning of universal brotherhood provides the only firm foundation for a better order of society.

Unity of Units

The individual cannot separate himself from the race, nor the race from the individual. The law of Karma applies equally to all, although all are not equally developed. In helping on the development of others, the Theosophist believes that he is not only helping them to fulfil their Karma, but that he is also, in the strictest sense, fulfilling his own. It is the development of humanity, of which both he and they are integral parts, that he has always in view, and he knows that any failure on his part to respond to the highest within him retards not only himself but all, in their progressive march. By his actions, he can make it either more difficult or more easy for humanity to attain the next higher plane of being.

—*The Key to Theosophy.*

INSTRUMENTS AND IDEALS

AN instrument is used for the accomplishment of an end—to facilitate progress toward an objective. Many whose objectives are limited to some partial phase of the betterment of mankind, or some degree of self-knowledge, transfer their concentration on the end in view to absorption in the means necessary for gaining the objective. They lose their way because they confuse the *means* with the object for which they strive. The instrument becomes the goal, an object of worship in itself. This error has been clearly perceived by great reformers who watched it frustrate ideals which had been the guiding spirit of their work. The Italian patriot, Mazzini, explained the delay of Italian unification as due to "the error which has led us to confound the principle with one of its manifestations; the eternal element of every social organization with one of its successive developments." "This error," he said, "has led us to break the unity of the conception precisely when it demands the widest extension."

The path of history is marked again and again by this pitfall, into which both individuals and nations have fallen. Those who see rightly that their immediate duty is to serve their nation, often fail to see that there is a higher than national ideal, an ideal of the brotherhood of all nations. Even patriots are blind to the fact that their duty does not cease with national success, but must be expanded to include a larger situation. So with the individual who desires the welfare and happiness of the select group to which he immediately belongs—his family or circle of friends. In his preoccupation with this limited betterment, though it may be part of the betterment of nation or race, he loses sight of the ideal of a more universal perfection.

Interdependence is a fact in nature, more or less evident. The true happiness of one is the happiness of all, for our living is bound up with the living of all other beings. Some dimly realize the nature of their universal duty and seek to fit themselves, by the improvement of their own capabilities, to be the better able to help and teach others. Again, others become completely engrossed in individual betterment in and of itself, thus distorting their perspective. They do not see that their own individual improvement is simply an instrument for the help of other beings. Self-improvement becomes identified with the concept of power *over* their fellow men, instead of *for* them. For such men the means to self-benefit are

formulated into a practical code of living. A perfected instrument becomes the sole desideratum, instead of the ideal toward which the instrument should be a means of progress.

Political reforms are always connected in some way with high ideals. They have ever been accomplished in the name of justice. Kings have been beheaded, dictators deposed, old constitutions sent by the board in order that justice might reign. But has injustice disappeared? For a time the ideology of a reformation may retain the spirit of its ideals, but history bears witness to the fact that those ideals ever become more remote, leaving behind the empty husk of a political form. Men forget the continual striving necessary for harmony and justice; they become content with mere parliamentary forms, naïvely believing that these somehow contain the spirit which contrived them. Actually, no political form is ever perfect. There are always those whose weaknesses bring to birth a new tyranny within the matrix of dead forms of freedom.

The great political change effected by the American colonists serves as a fitting example. In the minds of the active agents of American independence—Thomas Paine and George Washington —the rights of freedom of thought and freedom from governmental restraint were merely necessary means to a higher end. The Bill of Rights was a necessary instrument, forged for use in the building of a civilization of union and harmony. Thomas Paine visioned the universal aspect of this ideal, saw how the moral character which could develop in a free and independent nation might be a leaven for the whole world. Actually, what has happened? The uses of liberty have been perverted. We are led to suppose that a great civilization can arise automatically from the legal forms of freedom and independence. In reality, only half of the problem was solved by the Founders—that half which provided the proper instrument for the building of a great culture. Meanwhile, the use of the liberty so gained has proved the final determinant. While orations picturing the glories of American civil liberty are being delivered, the abuse of this instrument becomes ever more apparent.

When H. P. Blavatsky showed to the world the scope and the possibilities of the Theosophical Movement, how many stood fast to the ideal of universal betterment? And how many fell to quarreling over the structure of the Theosophical Society, which was merely an *instrument,* albeit a necessary one, to provide universal education in the fundamental principles of Theosophy? After her death some began to worship H. P. B. as a person, although she

had herself said that she was only an instrument for the spreading of true philosophy. Other members of the original society worshipped other personalities, yet from the standpoint of the *philosophy,* no personality could rightfully claim attention save as an instrument of the Theosophical Movement.

In the doctrines of Theosophy is a complete explanation of the instruments of man—his seven principles. The psychic propensities and relations of human beings were made clear by the enumeration of these principles. The psychic nature received attention by H. P. B. as an *instrument* for gaining knowledge. Yet how numerous were those calling themselves theosophists who degraded the name of Theosophy by worship of occult phenomena as an end in itself! Psychism is the idolatry of man's hidden instruments; it takes the form of exclusive concentration upon only one of the means by which the powers of the real man are unfolding. The higher ego, the true experiencer, receives scant attention from those who are subject to the bizarre fascination of the psychic nature.

Instruments, then, be they political guarantees of liberty or man's own powers, are necessary as *instruments* for experience of the soul. An idolatry of instruments beclouds perception of the real objectives. The only objectives worthy of man's striving are those based upon eternal values—the ideals of universal brotherhood and conscious interdependence. These are not instruments, but eternal ends and objectives in themselves.

PROFESSION AND PRACTICE

A man may be what he likes, the most worldly, selfish and hard-hearted of men, even a deep-dyed rascal, and it will not prevent him from calling himself a Christian, or others from so regarding him. But no Theosophist has the right to this name, unless he is thoroughly imbued with the correctness of Carlyle's truism: "The end of man is an *action* and not a *thought,* though it were the noblest"—and unless he sets and models his daily life upon this truth. The profession of a truth is not yet the enactment of it; and the more beautiful and grand it sounds, the more loudly virtue or duty is talked about instead of being acted upon, the more forcibly it will always remind one of the Dead Sea fruit.

—*The Key to Theosophy.*

ON THE LOOKOUT

Reincarnation in Fiction

Redbook for April began a reincarnation story, "Flight from Youth," the concluding instalment of which is printed in its June issue. Excellently written, and not far from the possible in dealing with an exceptional instance of immediate rebirth, it was doubtless read with enjoyment by *Redbook's* more than a million subscribers. Stories of this character are sometimes criticized by those who are acquainted with the Theosophical teachings because the author has not prefaced his romance with the "Three Fundamentals." This is manifestly unjust. "Flight from Youth" pretends to nothing more than good entertainment, with perhaps a measure of anti-war propaganda. While it will probably lead to some misconceptions as to the nature of reincarnation, even misconceptions about a thing that is true may be better than complete ignorance. Students of Theosophy have already taken advantage of the interest in reincarnation aroused by this story to present the truth to minds thus made receptive to the idea. H. P. B. made similar use of the writings of Dostoievsky, of Rider Haggard, of Bulwer, even of Marion Crawford.

Celebrated Witnesses

The editorial note which introduces "Flight from Youth" to *Redbook* readers is of far more importance than the story itself. Beginning with a quotation from Dr. Carrel, it names or quotes from nearly a score of writers and philosophers who have implied or affirmed a belief in reincarnation. Thus, from Kipling's *The Naulahka:*

> They will come back—come back again,
> As long as the red Earth rolls.
> He never wasted a leaf or a tree.
> Do you think He would squander souls?

From Schopenhauer's *Parerga and Paralipomena:*

> Were the Asiatic to ask me for a definition of Europe, I should be forced to answer him that it is that part of the world which is haunted by the incredible delusion that man was created out of nothing and that his present birth is his first entry into life.

"SCIENTISTS ARE ONLY MEN"

Others given as believing in rebirth are Gandhi, Cicero, Seneca, Virgil, Ovid, Shelley, Wordsworth, Plato, Longfellow, Whitman, Tennyson, Browning, and Sir Oliver Lodge. The passage taken from Dr. Carrel, while not specifically urging reincarnation, is worth repeating:

> Our mind has a natural tendency to reject the things that do not fit into the frame of the scientific or philosophical beliefs of our time. After all, scientists are only men. They are saturated with the prejudices of their environment and their epoch. They willingly believe that facts that cannot be explained by current theories do not exist. . . . At the present time, scientists . . . still look upon telepathy and other metaphysical phenomena as illusions. Evident facts having an unorthodox appearance are suppressed. . . . The inventory of the things which could lead us to a better understanding of the human being has been left incomplete. We must, then, go back to a naïve observation of ourselves in all our aspects, reject nothing and describe simply what we see.

The editors conclude their note with a thoughtful paragraph:

> It is not our purpose to make a case for or against Reincarnation. It is not our purpose to side with or against those scientists whom Dr. Carrel describes as being "saturated with the prejudices of their environment." But it is our purpose to call the attention of our readers to a beautifully written novel which moved us profoundly and which, we believe, will cause a great deal of discussion in a great many REDBOOK homes.

A more suitable introduction to the story is difficult to conceive. It is as though the editors have said: "This is not propaganda, but a story. However, if you become interested in reincarnation as a result of reading it, you will join the company of the world's greatest men. Reincarnation is not merely a romantic idea, but a philosophy of life."

APE EVOLUTION "DOWN AND OUT"

Dr. Ales Hrdlicka, curator of anthropology at the National Museum in Washington, has "discovered" that "the apes are on the way down and out and man on the way up and in." (New York *Times,* April 2.) While susbcribing to the popular "common ancestor" theory, Dr. Hrdlicka calls the gorilla, chimpanzee and gibbon, regarded by evolutionists as man's closest relatives, "racially senile." The apes, he thinks, have reached the end of their evolution, but man is getting better and better. The *Times* explains:

> These conclusions are based on measurements of skulls that have come down through the ages. Though bigness of head and brain is no longer regarded as an infallible indication of intelligence, there is no doubt that man is distinguished from the lower animals and even from lower men by his big head and brain. Especially significant is the increase in the cerebral cortex, or "bark" of the brain. It is this with which we do our thinking, this which necessarily increases as the brain enlarges.

"Cast-Off" Types

There is nothing new about Dr. Hrdlicka's theory. The opposite directions of ape and human development were described with great cogence by several scientists of the last century, notably the anatomists Lucae and Gratiolet. Evidences of similar character were assembled by Dr. Henry Fairfield Osborn. (See *Science,* May 20, 1927.) The ultimate extinction of the anthropoid apes was prophesied in *The Secret Doctrine* by H. P. B. in 1888: "In the Sixth Root-Race the fossils of the Orang, the Gorilla and the Chimpanzee will be those of extinct quadrumanous mammals; and new forms—though fewer and ever wider apart as ages pass on and the close of the Manvantara approaches—will develop from the 'cast off' types of the human races as they revert once again to astral, out of the mire of physical, life." (II, 263.)

Law of Recapitulation

Elsewhere in the same work H. P. B. marshals the evidence of the "law of recapitulation" to show the opposite paths of human and ape evolution, which, in the latter case, is rather a degeneration. This law, as commonly formulated, is that the development of the individual recapitulates the development of the race, or in other words, the ontogeny recapitulates the phylogeny. Following are the physiological facts:

> As proven by Gratiolet, with regard to the cavities of the brain of the anthropoids, in which species that organ develops in an inverse ratio to what would be the case were the corresponding organs in man really the product of the development of the said organs in the apes—the size of the human skull and its brain, as well as the cavities, increase with the individual development of man. His intellect develops and increases with age, while his facial bones and jaws diminish and straighten, thus being more spiritualized: whereas with the ape it is the reverse. In its youth the anthropoid is far more intelligent and good-natured, while with age it becomes duller; and, as its skull recedes and seems to diminish as it grows, its facial bones and

> jaws develop, the brain being finally crushed, and thrown entirely back, to make with every day more room for the animal type. The organ of thought—the brain—recedes and diminishes, entirely conquered and replaced by that of the wild beast—the jaw apparatus. (II, 682.)

The Theosophical explanation of the origin of the great apes—that they are the unnatural progeny of a union between man and beast—more obviously fits the known facts with each new observation. Only the *theories* of anthropology contradict Theosophy; and these theories are themselves an unnatural offspring of the union of intellect with materialism—a just though inexpressibly tragic retribution for man's misuse of his creative power.

THE GORILLA—AN ARTIST'S IMPRESSION

Lookout for THEOSOPHY of May, 1938, gave an extract from Ivan T. Sanderson's *Animal Treasure* in which the author records his conviction, held in common with the African tribe of Assumbos, that gorillas are "another race of man, and not animal at all." Now comes another book suggesting the same idea—*Frontiers of Enchantment* (Simon & Schuster, 1938), by W. R. Leigh, artist member of the Carl Akeley expedition to Africa in 1926-27. Mr. Leigh painted the settings of some of the animal group exhibits in the American Museum of Natural History in New York, giving evidence of his rare capacities as a landscape artist. His book shows forth the same sensitive perceptions and ability to record them as a painter of words. We quote a passage describing the gorilla:

> Fantastically ugly, when first sighted in his native haunts the gorilla gives the impression of unreality; of being some monstrous apparition conjured up by the imagination, wildly and appallingly hideous.
>
> Black, ungainly, with small cavernous eyes of red under beetling brows, he has huge, flat, flaring nostrils, and his repulsive muzzle is surrounded with ragged whiskers jutting from huge jowls. With his vast mouth open disclosing his fangs, he appears to be anything but an animal—a devil of the forest; a specter; a terrific nightmare phantom.
>
> It is impossible to have in his presence the same sensations as when facing a lion, an elephant, or any other member of the animal kingdom. It is impossible to escape a creepy suspicion that here is a creation higher than the brutes; a survival, by some mad trick of nature, from the dim dawn of history—somewhere back beyond the glacial age. He seems a Neander-

thal man—a remote kinsman, whom you instinctively hesitate to slay because it would seem too much like murder.

Not a Man—Not a Beast

> The man-ape arouses in you a psychological reaction no other animal produces. You know he is not a man, yet you feel that he is not a beast in the same sense that other animals are. Strange fancies race through your brain. Is this what we all looked like a million years ago? Do creatures like this rule on the moon or on Mars, supreme in some far-off sphere, as we on earth? Those irresistible feelings of fascinated terror, as you gaze at him, arise from no conscious train of thought: they are purely emotional, but none the less gripping, inescapable, and spring from the humanistic actions and attributes of the gorilla, as well as from his appearance. For not only does he look like a gnomish man—he acts like one (pp. 179-180).

Mr. Leigh's intuitions serve him well. Blurred copy of both Third and Fourth Race humanity, the gorilla is ensouled by a spark of the human essence. The egos imprisoned in ape forms are known in Theosophy as the Delayed Race, compelled by their Karma to incarnate in the animal forms. The apes, writes H. P. B.,

> . . . are truly "speechless men," and will become speaking animals (or men of a lower order) in the Fifth Round, while the adepts of a certain school hope that some of the Egos of the apes of a higher intelligence will reappear at the close of the Sixth Root-race. (*S. D.* II, 262.)

Balance of Nature

The recent plague of grasshoppers in the San Joaquin Valley, California, presents a most interesting example of the disastrous effects which flow from an unnatural disturbance of the equilibrium of Nature. For years, U. S. government officials waged a destructive war against the coyotes of the western plains because they occasionally preyed upon domestic sheep, cattle and poultry. But as the number of coyotes dwindled, the principal check on the propagation of wild rabbits and other small animals was eliminated, so that the latter increased enormously, and their depredations on crops soon caused the farmers to be worse off than before. The government now began destroying the rabbits, rats and mice by means of poison, trapping and shooting. As these animals consume numberless insects, their extermination in turn removed the natural check on the multiplication of grasshoppers. And now, the arsenic compounds sometimes used against the "hoppers" often results in toxic soil—in all, a vicious circle.

FOLLY OF DEFORESTATION

Such interferences with Nature's self-adjusting law of balance are numerous. Everyone is now familiar with the cause that produced the Dust Bowl: ploughing land that should never have been disturbed. Apparently we learn nothing from history, except that men learn nothing from history, for the same mistake was made in Europe over and over again in years past. To cite but one of many examples, in Switzerland large forests in mountainous areas were cut down, with the result that the soil accumulated over centuries was washed away. The destruction of the natural forests in the canton of Ticino during the fourteenth century is still felt by the extremely poor peasant population, whose land is now fit only for grazing. Yet the Europeans who emigrated to America repeated the same mistakes of their forebears.

Years ago the Swiss government, wishing to protect the chamois, a mountain species of antelope, practically exterminated the eagles who prey on the young chamois. The result, however, was the very opposite of what had been expected, for the eagles had preyed not only on the young, but also attacked sickly, diseased and weak chamois. The agent for natural selection thus removed, periodical diseases set in and the originally healthy and vigorous stock deteriorated.

RABBITS OVER-RUN AUSTRALIA

It is well known that the common rabbit has become a serious pest in Australia. When this quadruped was introduced by the early settlers into new surroundings which lacked all its natural enemies, only periodical famines and pestilences set limits to its endless multiplication. In an attempt to provide some "natural" enemies, cats were imported in the hope that they would keep down the number of rabbits. The result was that the cats themselves became a pest, whereupon dogs were imported to eat the cats. Thus a third pest was introduced! Similarly, when the prickly pear cactus was introduced into Australia it spread like wildfire. Finally hundreds of acres were *daily* rendered useless for farming. In this case, however, a parasite has been found which attacks the cactus successfully.

When a little Canadian waterweed was thrown out of a laboratory in England, it became such a nuisance that the canals and waterways in western Europe were clogged for years.

Law—Visible and Invisible

It is evident from all these examples that everywhere men are suffering the heavy penalties of ignorant interference with the balance of Nature. The workings of the law of cause and effect are readily evident in the physical world, but there is no reason why law should be limited only to the material plane. Some day the chain of cause and effect in the mental and moral world will be equally plain. A cause is a cause, whether it be on the psychic, intellectual, or any other plane, and will inevitably produce its corresponding effects. To bring about good results, it is necessary to work *with* Nature. This requires study, for without knowing the laws of Nature on all planes, one is bound to make mistakes and suffer their consequences.

More Notes on Sound

New properties of sound so highly pitched that it is inaudible have been discovered by Dr. R. Pohlmann of the Physico-Chemical Institute of the University of Berlin. These properties may have therapeutic application, according to the report in the New York *Times* for May 14. The lethal effects of some sound vibrations are well known:

> Inaudible sounds can kill seaweed, fish, frogs and other forms of life. The cells, it seems, swell and sometimes burst. When they burst death ensues. But this does not happen to the red corpuscles of the blood so long as they remain in their natural serum.
>
> It occurred to Pohlmann that swollen cells would absorb more foreign substances—medicines, for example—than normal cells. He coated frogs with a blue pigment, exposed them to high-pitched sounds which would not kill, and found that the dye was driven in as if the frogs had been tattooed with a needle. After a time the frogs recovered their normal hue. If dyes can thus be forced into cells, why not chemicals that will have a killing or healing effect, depending on the cell?
>
> By turning the sound waves on and off at the proper intervals it is possible to massage cells below the skin. Pohlmann thus massaged himself and his laboratory assistants and claims the results were encouraging in sciatica and some forms of neuralgia.

"Force" Therapy

High-frequency vibration of this type probably has some relation, in principle at least, with Keely's secret. Its destructive power suggests the capacity to suspend or destroy the cohesion of the cell. The proposed use of this power is in keeping with the underlying

theme of modern medical theory, which applies *force* to bring about a supposedly desirable end, instead of first attempting to understand from a philosophical point of view the nature and cause of disease. Materialism excludes from medical theory all but the grossest empiricism; empiricism, which views natural processes at the effect stage alone, demands a therapy which deals with effects at their own level, and force is the obvious answer. Modern physicians would do well to study the use of sound made by the temple priests of antiquity.

TRUTH DIES HARD

Certain occult truths which scientists persist in calling "superstitions" continue to be preserved in the lore of our race, despite the "debunking" efforts of modern educators. Dr. H. F. Kilander, dean of the Panzer (N. J.) College of Physical Education and Hygiene, recently made public a survey which showed that belief in "old wives' tales" still abounds among young and old alike. (New York *Times,* May 5. Following are some of the results of his three-year study of the beliefs of 11,000 high school seniors, college freshmen, and adults:

> Twenty-five per cent of all groups believe fish is a brain food. . . . five per cent of those queried asserted that excessive use of the brain might cause baldness. Forty per cent of the students and adults felt that a prospective mother could make her child more musical if she listened to good music. About the same number believed "various marks of disfiguration on the newborn child are due to fright of the mother during pregnancy."

SUGGESTED "EXPERIMENT"

While only 2 per cent of the high school seniors thought that thunderstorms would hasten the souring of milk, 6 per cent of the college freshmen and 9 per cent of the adults, according to Dr. Kilander, held that "misbelief." The theory that toads cause warts was accepted by 22 per cent of the high school and college students, and by 16 per cent of the adults. That raw meat would reduce a swelling or a "black eye" was believed by 40 per cent of the high school seniors, 36 per cent of the college freshmen and 20 per cent of the adults. (With respect to this last belief, the chances are with the high school and college boys as having greater opportunity for "experimental verification" of the raw meat hypothesis. Dr. Kilander might make a personal investigation of this question. In these days of advanced technology it should be a simple matter to

obtain two black eyes of equal shade. He might then apply raw meat to one of them and compare the rates of recovery, thus making the experiment "controlled" according to the very best scientific procedure.)

There is small wonder that nearly half those questioned thought that the fright of a pregnant mother may disfigure her child. Hardly a month goes by when some phase of the operation of this law is not reported in the press. Some fifteen pages of volume I of *Isis Unveiled* (pp. 384 ff.) are devoted to this subject, showing the wealth of evidence provided by writers extending from antiquity to the last century. Indeed, the May *Harper's* contains an article by George W. Gray, well known writer on scientific subjects, which should be sufficient to prevent any further denials of the power of imagination. His subject is "Anxiety and Illness," and while no mention is made of prenatal suggestion, several astonishing cases of the effect of thought on the body are described. There is no conceivable reason why this process could not also apply to the relation between mother and unborn child.

Superstition of Wholesale Denial

What should give educators pause in branding popular ideas as superstitions is the undeniable fact that the same beliefs occur among widely separated peoples whose origins, according to scientific theory, at least, can hardly be traced to a common stock except in the remotest of prehistoric times. The only explanation of the identity of these ideas, from this point of view, is that they arise from practical experience. Many of the theories of the ancients, long regarded as mere "superstitions," have recently been found to be well grounded in scientific fact (See Theosophy XXV, 404). While we do not claim a basis in fact for *all* the traditional beliefs which Dr. Kilander deplores, his wholesale denial of truth in *any* of them is hardly "scientific." Is it not probable that those who have lived on farms for many years may be more competent to say whether thunderstorms sour milk than the most erudite of laboratory scientists? The fact that this particular belief has been made the subject of a test by scientists, with negative results, may mean only that there are other factors which were not taken into consideration. Generally speaking, popular tradition is closer to the truth than theories which are based on abstractions from natural processes, instead of the experiences of a life close to nature, as *part* of nature.

"CHEIRO"

Jarrolds, Ltd., of London, have so far issued four or five editions of "Cheiro's" last book: *Confessions: Memoirs of a Modern Seer.* The book has had a very wide circulation—for tell-tale reasons. First, it deals with the "occult," as the curious-minded but amoral public interprets that term. Second, it is useful to others who practice or wish to practice the same profitable employment as "Cheiro." There are plenty of both classes. "Cheiro" was a notable success where many would-be competitors either fail or achieve but a mediocre return for their efforts to "employ spiritual or psychic powers for personal or sectarian purposes." In the psychic field the once-famous Daniel Dunglas Home ran a career in many respects the parallel as well as the forerunner of "Cheiro." In the "spiritual" (*i. e.,* religious) domain the list is much larger and more effective. Joseph Smith, Mary Baker Eddy, Thomas Lake Harris, John Humphrey Noyes, present-day "Father" Divine, Dr. Buchman, and the Ballards of "I Am" fame, all demonstrate the high-lights, while the lesser luminaries, the swarms of Yogis and their Western copyists are numberless.

"THE TWO PATHS"

"Cheiro" was the late Count Louis Hamon and his "practice" was almost entirely with men and women eminent in various fields. The casual reader would be astonished, in reading his "Confessions," to find how many of the world's great men and women went to him as Nicodemus went to Christ—secretly and at night. Theosophists will note two elements present throughout on the part of both practitioners and those who consult them. The purely personal equation is as unmistakable as it is unvarying. Those who run to these quarters are interested in themselves and their own good or bad fortunes—past, present, or future. Those who pander to them have identically the same self-interest. "What is there in it for *me?*" — this is the *Golden* rule. Thoughtful students of "human nature" will observe that the Occultism of H. P. Blavatsky leads in exactly the opposite direction. Those who take that path will be able to see clearly what "Cheiro" (one of "the best of the lot") was himself unable to read, namely, that those interested in questionable pursuits and practices of this kind represent former *failures* in true Occultism. They will see, no less clairvoyantly, that "Cheiro" was not in fact "reading hands," any more than a spiritualist medium or any psychic is reading a handkerchief, the handwriting, or any other physical object saturated with the *personal*

magnetism of the client or investigator. These, like the beads or cross or other talisman or sacred emblem, are mere focal points for "meditation with a seed." The lesson to be learned is simple: Is this the road to Self-knowledge, to Universal Brotherhood?

On "The Orphic Mysteries"

The Orpheus Glee Club of Flushing, New York, is not without appreciation of the noble symbolism contained in its name. Programs of concerts each bear a thoughtful note giving a portion of the truth concerning Orpheus. Following is the statement, taken from the *Theosophical Glossary,* in the Spring Concert program:

> The system of Orpheus is one of the purest morality. The theology taught by him is also purely Indian. With him the Divine Essence is inseparable from whatever *is* in the Infinite Universe, all forms being concealed from all Eternity in *It.* At determined periods these forms are manifested from the Divine Essence or manifest themselves. Thus through this law of emanation (or evolution) all things participate in this Essence, and are parts and members instinct with divine nature, which is omnipresent.
>
> All things having proceeded from, must necessarily return into it; and, therefore, innumerable transmigrations or metempsychoses, or reincarnations and purifications are needed before this final consummation can take place. This is pure Vedanta (Indian) philosophy.

"Vacuums" and "Empty Space"

The abstraction known to scientists as a "perfect vacuum" is sister conception to the "empty space" supposed to divide the heavenly bodies. Recently the General Electric Research Laboratories were requested to produce a bottle of "nothing," but the delivered article, a carefully sealed glass tube the size and shape of a champagne bottle, still contained 370 quadrillion molecules of various gases which the pumps were unable to remove, according to the learned estimate of the manufacturers. (New York *Herald-Tribune,* April 23.) The reality of Space as a Living Presence makes the idea of a perfect vacuum entirely ridiculous. There is living intelligence *everywhere,* and if it were possible to establish a true void anywhere, of whatever dimension, the whole cosmos would collapse to nothingness. The closest approach to a vacuum that can be conceived is the vortex of separateness created by a Black Magician, whose selfishness finally ends in the infinity of extinction.

USES OF ADVERSITY

The general fear of war in the western world, while tragic enough in its broad implications, seems in England to have fostered a spirit of humanitarianism. Recently, after Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain had announced to the House of Commons the decision of the British government to impose conscription in time of peace, George Lansbury, Labor leader and pacifist, rose to ask permission to introduce a bill forbidding the hunting of deer with hounds. As reported in the New York *Times* for April 27:

> "We are living in days when apparently brutality and violence are on the increase throughout the world," said white-haired Mr. Lansbury, adding that for many years determined efforts had been made in this country to put down cruelty to animals in every shape or form.
>
> The House, cheering, granted his request for unanimous consent to introduce the bill and then proceeded with debate on the budget.

The chase was once, for an English poet of the early eighteenth century—

> . . . the sport of kings,
> Image of war, without its guilt,

but now that war has become so horrible, the chase, too, is seen in a truer light. Let us hope that the approval of Mr. Lansbury's bill will not prove a mere momentary enthusiasm.

CAMERAS FOR GUNS

According to the New York *Times* of April 25, the San Francisco branch of the Society for Prevention of Cruelty to Animals has introduced a "disarmament program" for boys and girls. The children were invited to surrender their air guns and small rifles for new cameras, the purpose of the exchange being to stop the killing of birds and other wild life. "The one-day offer brought in more children and guns than the S. P. C. A. could handle," said Mr. Charles W. Friedrichs, San Francisco secretary of the organization. "We want to teach boys and girls to shoot with a camera instead of with a gun. Our program takes guns out of circulation and starts the children out on a study of wild-life. The more they learn, the better they will like them." If this attitude could be communicated to the parents who purchase or allow their children to have destructive toys, lasting benefit might be expected from a broader application of the S. P. C. A. plan.